



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,363	09/08/2003	Takeshi Hattori	Q77249	8238

7590 04/20/2006

SUGHRU MINO, PLLC  
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER
----------

VIJAYAKUMAR, KALLAMBELLA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/656,363	HATTORI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kallambella Vijayakumar	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 15 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 12 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 1751

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 are currently pending with the application. Claim 1 was amended, Claim-9 was cancelled, and Claims 14-15 were added containing the limitations of claims 10 and 11, that were allowed and objected to.

A phone call was made to Atty. John Callahan to condition the claim-1 in order to patentably distinguish it over the prior art by having the step of preparing raw aqueous solution by reduction treatment of aqueous solution containing indium and tetravalent tin ions as a positive step in the process did not materialize. The instant claim-1 containing a product by process limitation for the raw material preparation does not limit the raw material to that produced by that process.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1-4 and 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujiwara et al (JP 2000-281337).

The prior art teaches a method of making ITO with improved chromaticity by mixing  $\text{InCl}_3$  and  $\text{SnCl}_2$  and coprecipitating the mixed hydroxides by adding an alkali and calcining the hydroxides between 600-1300C in an atmosphere/feed-stream containing more than 1% by volume of hydrogen halide (Para 0006-0009, 0013, Claim-1). 100% divalent Sn in the raw solution further meets the ratio limitation of more than 50% divalent tin in claim-1. The prior art further teaches mixing the In and Sn salt solutions, alkali solution and water at a temperature of 40-100C and at pH of 4-7 (Claim-3). Further the raw material

Art Unit: 1751

solution was prepared by dissolving In and Sn metals in hydrochloric acid and this process is identical to that by the applicants (See Specification, Example-1). All the limitations of the instant claims are met.

The reference is anticipatory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 5 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al (JP 2000-281337) in view of Yukinobu et al (US 5,580,496).

The method of making ITO by Fujiwara et al in rejection-1 under 35 USC 102(b) is herein incorporated.

Art Unit: 1751

The prior art fails to teach the raw aqueous solution made by dissolving a substance containing In, Sn and O in an acid per claims 5 and 7-8.

In the analogous art, Yukinobu et al teach forming ITO using an In- source containing a solution obtained by dissolving indium hydroxide in an acid, and the Sn source containing tin halides or stannous hydroxide (Col-7, Ln 55-57; Col-8, Ln 5-9).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the prior art teachings and optionally substitute the In and Sn salts with hydroxides of In and Sn as functional equivalents and dissolve them in common HCl forming raw aqueous solution with reasonable expectation of success, because the prior art teaching is suggestive of the claimed method steps.

2. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujiwara et al (JP 2000-281337) in view of Fujiwara et al (US 6,051,166).

The method of making ITO by Fujiwara et al in rejection-1 under 35 USC 102(b) is herein incorporated.

The prior art fails to teach using of sodium/potassium hydroxide as alkali hydroxide per claim-13.

In the analogous art, Fujiwara et al (US-166) teaches the use of aqueous sodium hydroxide, ammonia or the like as the alkali hydroxide for co-precipitating In-Sn-hydroxides in the making of ITO (Col-3, Ln 60-63).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to optionally substitute the alkali hydroxide with sodium hydroxide as functional equivalent with reasonable expectation of success because the combined prior art teaching is suggestive of the claimed process step.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 14 and 15 allowed.

Claims 10-11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and claims 14-15 contain the limitations of 10 and 11 respectively.

Art Unit: 1751

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kallambella Vijayakumar whose telephone number is 571-272-1324. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30-6.00 Mon-Thu, 8.30-5.00 Alt Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on 571-272-1029. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1751

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KMV  
April 17, 2006.

  
DOUGLAS MCGINTY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

1751